ASEE EDGD Midyear Conference

70th Midyear Technical Conference: Graphical Expressions of Engineering Design

Comparison of Spatial Visualization Skills in Courses with Either Graphics or Solid Modeling Content

Jorge Rodriguez
Western Michigan University, jorge.rodriguez@wmich.edu

Luis G. Rodriguez
University of Wisconsin - Waukesha, luis.rodriguez@uwc.edu

Comparison of Spatial Visualization Skills in Courses with Either Graphics or Solid Modeling Content

J. Rodriguez
Department of Engineering Design, Manufacturing, and Management Sciences
Western Michigan University

L. G. Rodriguez
Engineering Department
University of Wisconsin – Waukesha

Abstract

This paper presents a comparison made between visualization skills in a group of students that take a course with graphics topics, and those that take a course with solid modeling. The graphics course (2D) is in the context of manual drafting and a drafting software, while the solid modeling course (3D) in based on the utilization of concepts and software for solid modeling. The objective pursued is to identify any possible benefit, from the point of view of improved spatial visualization skills, from either of these two approaches. The visualization aptitude of the students was measured by administering the standard PSVT:R test before and after the respective topics were covered. This evaluation was done at two different academic institutions, with each one of the institutions using either a graphics or a solid modeling approach. Results from this study have relevance when defining course content, particularly with the current trend of including 2D and 3D topics in one single course. The result of the comparison indicates that although there are numeric differences between the two groups, particularly with standard deviations, they are not statistically significant to make a claim about the visualization skills of courses with 2D or 3D approach.

Introduction

Visualization has received significant attention from practitioners and researchers in fields such as education, psychology, and engineering. Visualization skills have been often linked to mental capabilities that indicate likeliness or aptitude to perform certain tasks or professions. Similarly, there are numerous reports on exercises that focus on developing, evaluating, and improving visualization skills, both, for development of imagination and creativity, as well as development of competencies directly related to technical fields such as engineering graphics and design.

In this field of graphics and design, which is more linked to STEM education, there are test such as the Purdue Spatial Visualization Test - Rotations PSVT:R (Guay, 1977), the Mental Cutting Test (MCT) (Sorby, 1999) and Shepard-Metzler Rotation (S-M) Test (Shepard, 1971) and its modification (Vandenberg, 1978). The underlying concept in these tests is the mental rotation of 3D objects. PSVT:R is perhaps one of the most commonly used test, and after its initial development in 1977, there have been reports about improvements and expansion of tests for spatial visualization and spatial orientation. For PSVT:R in particular, there are reports based on trimetric representation (Branoff, 2000), the use of realistic 3D views (Yue, 2008), and the use of pictorials (Ernst, 2015).

As well, there are reports on techniques being utilized in order to develop spatial visualization skills (*e.g.*, use of computer software [Shavalier, 2004], use of 3D printed models [Katsioloudis, 2014], just as there are reports on the applicability and usefulness of various approaches (e.g., new and improved course content [Sorby, 2005], training for drafting [Samsudin, 2011]. These reports are a very small set that indicates the interest in having appropriate materials for improvement of spatial visualization skills, perhaps given the reports [Sorby, 2005] that such skills are a significant factor predicting success in technological programs.

Methodology

This study was designed to ascertain any difference in the spatial visualization skill of students that have 2D-based (drafting) or 3D-based (solid modeling) instruction. In most engineering and technology degrees students are required to have a course in technical graphics. There is variety of contents and approaches being used nowadays, with the most typical offering being a first-year course where students are offered spatial visualization topics using 2D concepts, such as orthogonal views and multi-views. In the past couple of decades it has been a trend to have first-year courses that cover similar visualization topics but in the context of 3D solid modeling. Nowadays, there is another trend were academic institutions have a hybrid course, where approximately half the course is in 2D concepts, and the second half covers 3D concepts. This study pursues the assessment of any benefits on spatial visualization by students having 3D concepts in addition to 2D concepts in their curriculum.

The study was completed at two institutions, in institution A (University of Wisconsin - Waukesha) there is now a hybrid semester course where half of the course uses Autodesk's AutoCAD, and the other half of the semester is done utilizing Autodesk's Inventor. The other participating institution B (Western Michigan University) offers a semester course which is based on instruction utilizing solid modeling packages, first Siemens' NX and then Dessault Systemes' CATIA. One reason of having two institutions is the independent offerings, implying that there are no students that might have taken other courses. The students at both institutions have already decided on engineering or engineering technology programs, and both institutions are in a semester schedule.

The instrument selected to evaluate spatial visualization skills of the students was the Purdue test for rotations (PVST:R), given that it is an instrument that requires higher level of spatial visualization skills because of the use of inclined, oblique, and curved surfaces [Yue, 2004]. This set of 30 questions, where the number of mental manipulations increases as the test progresses, was administered three times to both groups of students: at the beginning of the semester, midway through the semester, and at the end of the semester. The decision to include a midway evaluation was due to the fact that it is the moment when 2D instruction switches to 3D instruction at institution a, and it is the moment when institution B switches from the first 3D software

(NX) to the second one (CATIA). Additionally, demographic information was collected from each participant, mainly gender, race, and program of study.

Results

The surveys were administered to the students, and their participation was completely optional, during the current semester. The demographic information for both groups is provided in Table 1. In the first institution there was a total of 19 students participating (from a total of 20 registered), and at Institution B there was a group of 36 participants (from 42 students registered students). The breakdown based on gender is similar at both institutions (10.5% at A, versus 13.9% at B), with higher percentages of under-represented and no traditional students at institution B.

Table 1. Demographics for each institution participating in the comparison.

Demographic Information				
	Institution A (UWW) (Graphics)		**Institution B (WMU)** (Solid Modeling)	
	#	%	#	%
Number of Students	19		36	
Female Students	2	10.5	5	13.9
Male Students	17	89.5	31	86.1
Under-represented (gender, race)	3	15.8	8	22.2
Non-traditional (>25)	3	15.8	12	33.3

Participation in the survey was without any incentive offered, besides the explanation indicating that this will be used to possible redefinition of course content, and their help will be greatly appreciated. The test was administered during lecture time, during the last 25 minutes, and there has been a high level of participation (95% at location A, and 90% at location B). Two examples went explained before the first time they did the test, and as clarification it was indicated that all figures represent solid objects (3D).

Descriptive statistics for the compiled test scores at both institutions are provided in the upper part of Table 2. From the table it can be stated that the scores have some minor difference between institutions, these results indicate as well that the average scores, as the semester progresses, show slight increase at both institutions. Similarly, the results show the decreasing trend of the standard deviation as the semester progresses. Regarding the minimum/maximum, both institutions show a small increase in the minimum score as the end of the semester.

In order to find out if there is any statistically significant differences between results from each institution, or from pre- to post-, a T-test was performed on the different sets of data. The lower part of Table 2 shows the results when 95% confidence is applied. In this case all confidence intervals indicate that there is no statistical significance between the sets analyzed. In order to have statistical significance, as shown in the table for each institution, there needs to be a confidence probability of 35% at institution A, and 55% at institution B, which are very low confidence levels.

Table 2. Summary of Results Comparing 2D and 3D Course Content.

Evaluation Results						
	Institution A			Institution B		
	Pre-	*Mid-*	*Post-*	*Pre-*	*Mid-*	*Post-*
Average	22.84	23.83	24.00	22.43	23.72	24.07
Standard Deviation	4.48	4.86	4.58	4.75	4.00	2.52
Minimum Score	15	15	17	13	12	19
Maximum Score	30	30	30	30	30	29
Median Score	22	24	23	23	24	24
Probability (T-test)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Lower Limit (LCI)	20.681	21.413	21.464	20.798	22.069	22.674
Upper Limit (UCI)	24.999	26.247	26.536	24.062	25.958	25.371
Probability (for significance)	-	0.65	0.61	-	0.45	0.3

Some additional information was observed, during the tests, only once a student asked for clarification on a problem, and the response given was that all representation are solids. From the data, question #30 was the one with the lowest percentage of correct answers, with only 29% correct answers recorded across the board, no other question had lower than 50% correct answers. The effect of not including question #30 in the results in less than 1.6% in the overall values, which will not have any significant effect on the data being used for conclusions in this study.

Conclusions

The results from this comparison indicate numerical differences between the two course approaches, but there is no statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) difference in the results. Similarly, the results indicate an improvement in the performance at each institutions as the semester term progresses, but without statistical significance. Therefore, even though there is no objective conclusion in terms of the benefit of one instructional approach over the other (2D *vs* 3D), this study has brought attention to other aspects that need to be investigated (*e.g.*, course exercises, teaching approaches, test applicability).

At both institutions there was anecdotal reference to 'doing better with visualization exercises', which is reflected in the descriptive statistics, particularly with standard deviation and minimum score. It can be stated that the scores for each group of students become more compact (*i.e*, smaller range, better performance), with the largest improvement at the end of the semester at institution B.

References

Ben-Chaim, D., Lappan, G., and Houang, R. T. (1988). The Effect of Instruction on Spatial Visualization Skills of Middle School Boys and Girls. American Educational research Journal, 25(1), 51-71.

Conolly, P., Harris, L. V. A., and Sadowski, M. (2009). Measuring and Enhancing Spatial Visualization in Engineering Technology Students. Proceedings of ASEE Annual Conference and Exhibition, 14.868.1-9.

Guay, R. (1977). Purdue Spatial Visualization Test - Visualization of Rotations. W. Lafayette, IN. Purdue Research Foundation.

Branoff, T. J. (2000). Spatial Visualization Measurement: A Modification of the Purdue Spatial Visualization Test-Visualization of Rotations. Engineering Design Graphics Journal, 64(2), 14-22.

Ernst, J. V., Lane, D. & Clark, A. C., (2015). Pictorial Visual Rotation Ability of Engineering Design Graphics Students. Engineering Design Graphics Journal, 79 (1), 1-13.

Katsioloudis, P., Jovanovic, V., and Jones, M. (2014). A Comparative Analysis of Spatial Visualization Ability and Drafting Models for Industrial and technology Education Students. Journal of Technology Education, 26(1), 88-101.

Kinsey, B. L., Towle, E., and Onyancha, R. M. (2008). Improvement of Spatial Ability Using Innovative Tools: Alternative View Screen and Physical Model Rotator. Engineering Design Graphics Journal, 72(1), 1-8.

Maeda, Y. & Yoon, S. Y. (2013). A Meta-Analysis on Gender Differences in Mental Rotation Ability Measured by the Purdue Spatial Visualization Tests: Visualization of Rotations (PSVT: R). Educational Psychology Review, 25(1), 69-94.

Samsudin, K., Rafi, A., and Hanif, A. S. (2011). Training in Mental Rotation and Spatial Visualization and Its Impact on Orthographic Drawing performance. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 14(1), 179-186.

Shavalier, M. (2004). The Effect of CAD-Like Software on the Spatial Ability of Middle School Students. Journal of Educational Computing Research, vol. 31 no. 1, 37-49.

Shepard, R. & Metzler, J. (1971). Mental Rotation of Three-dimensional Objects. Science, 171, 701-703.

Sorby, S. A. (1999). Developing 3-D Spatial Visualization Skills. Engineering Design Graphics Journal, 63(1), 21-32.

Sorby, S. A. (2005). Assessment of a "New and Improved" Course for the Development of 3-D Spatial Skills. Engineering Design Graphics Journal, 69(3), 6-13.

Vandenberg, S. G. & Kuse, A. R. (1978). Mental Rotations, a group test of Three-dimensional Spatial Visualization. Perception and Motor Skills, 47, 559-604.

Wai, J., Lubinski, D. & Benbow, C. P. (2009). Spatial Ability for STEM Domains Aligning Over 50 Years of Cumulative Psychological Knowledge Solidifies Its Importance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 101, 817-835.

Yue, J. (2004). Spatial Visualization by Orthogonal Rotations. Proceedings of ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, 9.1114.1-10.

Yue, J. (2008). Spatial Visualization by Realistic 3D Views. Engineering Design Graphics Journal, 72(1), 28-38.